

BLACK HOLE PRODUCTION VIA QUANTUM TUNNELING

SERGEY N. SOLODUKHIN

*Theoretische Physik, Ludwig-Maximilians Universität, Theresienstrasse 37, D-80333,
München, Germany*

Particles colliding at impact parameter much larger than the effective gravitational radius can not classically form a black hole and just scatter off the radial potential barrier separating the particles. We show that the process of the black hole production can still go quantum-mechanically via familiar mechanism of the under-barrier tunneling. The mechanism is illustrated for collision of a trans-Planckian particle and a lighter particle. Our analysis reveals instability of trans-Planckian particles against transition to the phase of black hole.

It has been for long time an intriguing problem to study in detail the possibility to create black holes in collision of particles. Many attempts [1] were done in the past to attack this problem although the technical difficulties are such that exact solutions of General Relativity describing this process are still not available. (Although a considerable progress in this direction has been recently made in [2]). This problem however became of a practical interest recently due to increasing popularity of the models predicting higher-dimensional Planckian scale at 1 TeV. If these models are correct the trans-Planckian energy should be available already in the next generation of colliders or in cosmic rays. The black hole production then should be a typical event the experimentalists are going to detect [3].

Although a detailed theoretical description of the black hole production in trans-Planckian collisions is not yet known some basic principles are available. Mostly, it is based on the picture of the gravitational collapse as we know it in General Relativity. In particular, applying Thorne's hoop conjecture [4] to the present situation we arrive at a conclusion that two particles with energy E_1 and E_2 respectively should form a black hole if they collide at impact parameter b less than the effective gravitational radius of the system, $r_g = 2GM$, $M = E_1 + E_2$ being the total energy of the particles. Indeed, they approach each other in the spacetime region sufficiently small to turn on the strong gravitational interaction. On the other hand, for particles approaching each other at shortest distance larger than r_g the gravitational force is not strong enough and particles just scatter. The reason for that is simple: the gravitational attraction between the particles should compensate the centrifugal

gal repulsion in order to particles could come close to each other. The fight of two forces manifests in the radial potential barrier separating the particles. Low energy particles or particles falling towards each other at large impact parameter b come close to the bottom of the barrier and thus get reflected not forming a black hole. This situation is however the most typical one: the wave length of particles normally available in experiments is much bigger than the corresponding gravitational radius. Such particles can not produce black hole in the classical theory. In this note we demonstrate that the process can still go quantum-mechanically via the mechanism of quantum tunneling through the barrier. Throughout, the standard four-dimensional gravity is understood, generalizations to higher dimensions being either straightforward or trivial.

To set the stage we need a simple model in which the analysis of the black hole production could be done. An appropriate model was suggested in [5] and consists in replacing the original picture of two colliding particles by an approximate one in which a test particle with energy $\omega = \frac{\mathbf{E}_1 \mathbf{E}_2}{\mathbf{E}_1 + \mathbf{E}_2}$ falls onto the gravitating center of mass $M = \mathbf{E}_1 + \mathbf{E}_2$ from infinity at the impact parameter b . In the Newtonian mechanics the second picture is completely equivalent to the original. It is not the case in General Relativity. A good approximation however is expected, at least in the case when one of the particles is much heavier than another. The total gravitational field is modelled by the field of the gravitating center and is described by the Schwarzschild metric. It has horizon at $r = r_g$. We consider it to be a fictitious horizon until it gets crossed by the test particle. The test particle then inevitably falls to the center. This signals for the formation of the black hole (with the actual event horizon being formed) in the original picture. The study of black hole production in this model thus reduces to the analysis of the gravitational capture of the test particle by the gravitating center.

First, let us analyse the process classically. The classical radial motion of the test particle is determined by the geodesic equation (we put $c = 1$)

$$\left(\frac{dr}{dt}\right)^2 = \left(1 - \frac{r_g}{r}\right)^2 b^2 \left(\frac{1}{b^2} - V(r)\right) \quad , \quad V(r) = \frac{1}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{r_g}{r}\right) \quad , \quad (1)$$

where we used the fact that for a ultra-relativistic particle, its energy ω and angle momentum L (computed with respect to the gravitating center) are related as $L/\omega = b$. The potential $V(r)$ in (1) plays the role of the effective radial potential between the gravitating center and the test particle. Its form is a result of the interplay of two forces acting in the opposite directions: the gravitational attraction and the centrifugal repulsion. This potential vanishes at horizon, $r = r_g$, and at infinity, $r \rightarrow \infty$, and develops a maximum in between

at $r_m = \frac{3}{2}r_g$. For a particle coming from infinity at the impact parameter b the crucial relation is the relation between $1/b^2$ and the maximal value $V(r_m) = \frac{4}{27r_g^2}$ of the effective radial potential. Particle coming from infinity with the impact parameter $b < b_{\text{cr}} = 3\sqrt{3}/2r_g$ goes above the maximum of the potential and gets captured by the gravitating center. Having in mind the original picture of the colliding particles we say that there forms a black hole with size r_g . As a side remark note that in the Newtonian mechanics the radial potential monotonically grows to infinity when particles approach each other so that the gravitational capture is never possible. The latter thus is an important feature of General Relativity and is absent in the Newtonian case.

If the test particle falls below the maximal value of the potential, this happens for large impact parameter $b > b_{\text{cr}}$, the particle just scatters off the center and the gravitational capture does not happen. In the original picture, this would correspond to particles passing each other at far distance without actually forming a black hole. Thus, this model predicts that, classically, two colliding particles form a black hole if they pass each other at the shortest distance $b < b_{\text{cr}} = 3\sqrt{3}/2r_g$ (where r_g is the gravitational radius for the system of these two particles). The particle with $b > b_{\text{cr}}$ comes close to the bottom of the potential barrier and gets reflected. Thus, the classical cross-section for the black hole formation is given by

$$\sigma_{\text{cl}} = \pi b_{\text{cr}}^2 = \frac{27}{4}\pi r_g^2 = 27\pi G^2 M^2 . \quad (2)$$

This picture can be also analysed quantum mechanically. The relevant processes, the black hole scattering and absorption, were well studied in the past. With new interpretation according to our picture of the black hole production this study appears in a new light. Decomposing quantum fields in the spherical harmonics, $\Phi_{lm} \sim \frac{u_l(r, \omega)}{r} e^{-i\omega t} Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi)$, one arrives at the radial wave equation

$$\left(\frac{d^2}{dr_*^2} + \omega^2 - U_l(r) \right) u_l(r, \omega) = 0, \quad (3)$$

which is a quantum mechanical analog of the classical equation (1). We denote $\frac{d}{dr_*} = (1 - \frac{r_g}{r}) \frac{d}{dr}$ and

$$U_l(r) = (1 - \frac{r_g}{r}) \left(\frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} + \frac{r_g(1-s^2)}{r^3} \right) , \quad (4)$$

where s is spin of the test particle (below we put $s = 0$), is the effective potential similar to the potential in eq.(1). The equation (3) describes the

scattering by the potential (4). The relevant modes are defined to be in- and out-going at infinity $r_* \rightarrow \infty$, $u_l(r, \omega) \sim A_{\text{out}}(\omega)e^{i\omega r_*} + A_{\text{in}}(\omega)e^{-i\omega r_*}$, and only out-going at horizon $u_l(r, \omega) \sim e^{-i\omega r_*}$, $r_* \rightarrow -\infty$. Again, we say that the black hole production takes place in the original picture if the wave gets absorbed by the fictitious horizon surrounding the gravitating center of mass M . The probability of a wave to penetrate through the potential barrier is

$$\Gamma_{l,\omega} = 1 - \left| \frac{A_{\text{out}}}{A_{\text{in}}} \right|^2 .$$

Note, that it is probability for a spherical wave. Since the actual wave at infinity looks more like a plane wave the latter should be decomposed in the spherical modes

$$e^{-i\omega z} = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} K_l(\omega) Y_{l0}(\theta, \phi) \quad , \quad K_l(\omega) = \frac{i^l}{2\omega} [4\pi(2l+1)]^{1/2} . \quad (5)$$

The cross-section to capture the test particle is then defined as follows

$$\sigma_{\text{quant}} = \sum_l |K_l|^2 \Gamma_{l,\omega} . \quad (6)$$

It is also convenient to consider each partial wave characterized by angular momentum l as falling on the gravitating center at impact parameter b ,

$$b = \left(l + \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{1}{\omega} .$$

The potential (4) is quite similar to the potential $V(r)$ in the classical problem (1). Analyzing the scattering of a partial wave by this potential it is important to find relation between the energy ω of the in-falling particle and the height of the radial potential barrier. For small b (large energy ω at fixed l), one finds that the height of the barrier is the same as in the classical case and corresponds to the same impact parameter $b = b_{\text{cr}}$. This is what we could have expected: in the high energy limit the geometrical optics analysis based on equation (1) becomes a good approximation. In this limit the horizon absorbs partial waves which go above the potential barrier, i.e. with the impact parameter $b \leq \frac{3}{2}r_g$, so that the cross-section (6) should approach the classical value (2).

We are however more interested in the opposite limit of small ω . It can be also viewed as limit of small $\omega r_g \ll 1$ or, equivalently, of large impact parameter $b \gg r_g$. In this case the test particle falls very close to the bottom of the potential barrier and, classically, can not penetrate through the barrier.

The quantum mechanical picture however is more intriguing. The quantum particle can *tunnel* through the barrier. Note that in the present case we do not expect exponentially small factors, usually accompanying the semiclassical analysis of the quantum tunneling, to appear. The semiclassical picture fails to describe the tunneling of small energy quantum particle. Rather, we have to rely on exact analysis. Indeed, it is well known from standard courses of Quantum Mechanics (see for example [7]) that the probability to tunnel through the barrier grows as some power of the energy when energy is close to zero. Specifically, for the problem at hand, the transmission probability $\Gamma_{l,\omega}$ grows as ω^{2l+2} for small ω and thus dominates for s-wave. On the other hand, the contribution of s-wave in the in-falling plane wave diverges $|K_l|^2 \sim \frac{1}{\omega^2}$, as is seen from (5). The two tendencies compensate each other in the cross-section (6) for the s-wave. As a result, in the regime of small ω the cross-section (6) approaches a finite number equal to the horizon area [6]

$$\sigma_{\text{quant}} \simeq \pi r_g^2 = 4\pi G^2 M^2 \quad . \quad (7)$$

Since only the wave that approaches horizon radially is absorbed it is not surprising that the cross-section becomes equal to the horizon area. Thus, despite the fact that the process is forbidden classically it still can go via the mechanism of the quantum tunneling through the potential barrier, the cross section (7) being entirely due to the quantum tunneling effect.

The discussed mechanism should play an important role in the collision of a trans-Planckian particle with a lighter particle. In this case the total energy is trans-Planckian, $E_1 + E_2 \gg E_{\text{p1}}$, while the size of the system given by the wave length of the lighter particle is much bigger than the effective gravitational radius of the system, i.e. we have that $\omega r_g \simeq E_1 E_2 / E_{\text{p1}}^2 \ll 1$. Classically, the black hole formation is forbidden in this case. The black hole can nevertheless be produced via the tunneling mechanism discussed above. Our consideration also sheds light on the nature of the trans-Planckian particles [8]. Indeed, such a particle is characterized by a wave length $\lambda \sim 1/E$ which is much smaller than the corresponding gravitational radius $r_g \sim E/E_{\text{p1}}^2$. So it is an example of a system which lies within its gravitational radius. However, we can not call it black hole since the whole effect is purely kinematic: one can go to another, boosted, reference frame in which the massive particle is at rest and clearly not a black hole. Our consideration suggests that trans-Planckian particles are unstable against the black hole formation. Indeed, the collision with any low energy particle, it meets on its way, sets the frame invariant energy scale. The low-energy particle then gets absorbed via the tunneling mechanism just described and the black hole forms. Due to this process a trans-Planckian

particle which happens to move in a medium filled with lower-energy particles makes transition to the essence of completely different nature. Atmosphere of Earth might be such a medium to initiate this transition for the ultra high-energy intruders.

This work is supported by the grant DFG-SPP 1096.

- [1] G. 't Hooft, Phys. Let. B **198**, 61 (1987); D. Amati, M. Ciafaloni and G. Veneziano, Phys. Let. B **197**, 81 (1987); H. Verlinde and E. Verlinde, Nucl. Phys. B **371**, 246 (1992).
- [2] D. M. Eardley and S. B. Giddings, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 044011 (2002) [arXiv:gr-qc/0201034]; E. Kohlprath and G. Veneziano, JHEP **0206**, 057 (2002) [arXiv:gr-qc/0203093].
- [3] S. B. Giddings and S. Thomas, arXiv:hep-ph/0106219; S. Dimopoulos and G. Landsberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 161602 (2001); S. B. Giddings, arXiv:hep-ph/0110127.
- [4] K. S. Thorne, "Nonspherical Gravitational Collapse: A Short Review," in *Magic Without Magic*, ed. J. R. Klauder, San Francisco 1972.
- [5] S. N. Solodukhin, Phys. Lett. B **533**, 153 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0201248].
- [6] A. A. Starobinsky, Sov. Phys. JETP **37** (1973) 28; W. G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. D **14** (1976) 3251; S. R. Das, G. W. Gibbons and S. D. Mathur, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 417 (1997).
- [7] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics*.
- [8] G. 't Hooft, Class. Quant. Grav. **16**, 395 (1999).